2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: Biomedical Informatics, Library and Data Sciences Review Committee

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 08:28:56 AM

1. Department or Agency
Department of Health and Human Services

2. Fiscal Year
2018

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Biomedical Informatics, Library and Data Sciences Review Committee

3b. GSA Committee No.

787

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?
No

5. Current Charter
01/18/1991

6. Expected Renewal Date

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?
No

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear
Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?
Not Applicable

10b. Legislation Pending?
Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law

12. Specific Establishment Authority
42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16)

13. Effective Date
11/20/1985

14. Commitee Type
Continuing

14c. Presidential?
No

15. Description of Committee Grant Review Committee

16a. Total Number of Reports
No Reports for this FiscalYear

17a. Open 0 **17b. Closed** 4 **17c. Partially Closed** 0 **Other Activities** 0 **17d. Total** 4

Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start		End
NIH Peer Review	11/02/2017	-	11/03/2017
NIH Peer Review	03/08/2018	-	03/09/2018
NIH Peer Review	06/07/2018	-	06/08/2018
NIH Peer Review	06/08/2018	-	06/08/2018

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 4

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	$28,800.00	$28,800.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	$91,870.00	$92,184.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	$0.00	$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	$129,797.00	$132,166.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00

18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	$0.00	$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	$0.00	$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	$150.00	$153.00
18d. Total	$250,617.00	$253,303.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.70	0.70

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications (and/or contract proposals) in the fields of medical informatics, biotechnology information, librarianship, health sciences, information science, and education. During this reporting period the committee reviewed and scored 196 applications requesting $662,522,296.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The members of this committee are authorities knowledgeable in fields of the health sciences, librarianship, education, medical informatics, learning resources, information science, and biotechnology.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The Biomedical Informatics, Library and Data Sciences Review Committee held four meetings during FY 2018 on November 2-3, 2017, March 8-9, 2018, June 7-8, 2018 (morning of 8th only) and June 8, 2018 (afternoon) and plans to hold three meetings in FY 2019.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This committee is composed of recognized authorities in biomedical information research and technology and provides first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The meetings of the Biomedical Informatics, Library and Data Sciences Review Committee were closed to the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property,

such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

21. Remarks

This committee did not produce any reports during this reporting period. URL: This committee does not have a dedicated website. Committee Decision Maker and Designated Federal Official are the same individual based on assigned duties within NLM.

Designated Federal Officer
ZOE HUANG CHIEF SCIENTIFIC REVIEW OFFICER

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
ARCHER, KELLIE	07/01/2014	06/30/2018	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BAHAR, IVET	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BARR, PAUL	06/08/2018	06/08/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BERNSTAM, ELMER	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN	Peer Review Consultant Member
BURNS, GULLY	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	RESEARCH LEAD	Peer Review Consultant Member
CALLAHAN, ALISON	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	RESEARCH SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHEN, ELIZABETH	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CIMINO, JAMES	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DAVULURI, RAMANA	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DENNY, JOSHUA	07/01/2014	06/30/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DONALDSON, DEVAN	07/01/2018	06/30/2021	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DORR, DAVID	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR AND VICE CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ELHADAD, NOEMIE	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GENNARI, JOHN	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GUSEV, YURIY	06/08/2018	06/08/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HOLMES, JOHN	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HOLMES, KRISTI	07/01/2014	06/30/2018	DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KANN, MARICEL	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KLEINBERG, SAMANTHA	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LATHROP, RICHARD	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LENERT, LESLIE	06/07/2018	06/08/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

LI, BINGSHAN	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MCCOY, ALLISON	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MONTI, STEFANO	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MOONEY, SEAN	07/01/2014	06/30/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PAGE, JR., C. DAVID	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PARKER, JOEL	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PATEL, CHIRAG	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PEISSIG, PEGGY	06/07/2018	06/08/2018	RESEARCH SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
RALSTON, JAMES	06/08/2018	06/08/2018	SENIOR INVESTIGATOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SADASIVAM, RAJANI SHANKAR	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCHLEYER, TITUS	06/08/2018	06/08/2018	RESEARCH SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
SEYMOUR, ANNE	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SHATKAY, HAGIT	06/08/2018	06/08/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SHIPMAN, JEAN	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	HEALTH SCIENCES LIBRARIAN	Peer Review Consultant Member
SMALHEISER, NEIL	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SUN, JIMENG	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SWAMIDASS, S. JOSHUA	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
TAYLOR, CASEY	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ZHANG, RUI	06/08/2018	06/08/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 40

Narrative Description

The Biomedical Informatics, Library and Data Sciences Review Committee is meeting its mission as the Initial Review Group for grants submitted to the Extramural Program of the NLM. The BILDS advises and makes recommendations to the NLM Board of Regents on the scientific and technical merit of grants and contracts related to health science libraries, clinical informatics, bioinformatics, biomedical publications, and biomedical computing.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

Improvements to health or safety ☐

	Checked if Applies
Trust in government	☐
Major policy changes	☐
Advance in scientific research	✔
Effective grant making	✔
Improved service delivery	☐
Increased customer satisfaction	☐
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	☐
Other	☐

Outcome Comments

N/A

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
None	☐
Unable to Determine	✔
Under $100,000	☐
$100,000 - $500,000	☐
$500,001 - $1,000,000	☐
$1,000,001 - $5,000,000	☐
$5,000,001 - $10,000,000	☐
Over $10,000,000	☐
Cost Savings Other	☐

Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent disease.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

2,206

Number of Recommendations Comments

The Biomedical Informatics, Library and Data Sciences Review Committee have reviewed 2206 applications, which includes 196 this FY.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

45%

% of Recommendations <u>Fully</u> Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

What is the approximate <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be <u>Partially</u> implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations <u>Partially</u> Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ✓   No ☐   Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

The Director of Extramural Programs and/or the Director, NLM, present progress reports on the programs and policies of the Library at each meeting.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities ☐
Reallocated resources ☐

Issued new regulation ☐
Proposed legislation ☐
Approved grants or other payments ✓
Other ☐

Action Comments

An action of "approved" or "recommended" for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH's funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant's management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated **Number** of grants reviewed for approval	196
What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval	196
What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval	$662,522,296

Grant Review Comments

N/A

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	✓
Online Agency Web Site	✓
Online Committee Web Site	☐
Online GSA FACA Web Site	✓
Publications	☐
Other	✓

Access Comments

Contact the National Library of Medicine Committee Management Office.